

JUN 15 2007

06/15/2007 14:27 FAX 2127566078

SRZ LLP

008/010

Attorney Docket No. 848075/0049REMARKS

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted this week to discuss the Office Action mailed March 21, 2007, and the outstanding claim rejections. As discussed with the Examiner, the amendment to claim 13 now clarifies a distinction between claim 13 and the cited prior art. In particular, claim 13 now makes clear that the image capturing direction (which is interlocked with the folding angle) of the image capturing unit varies according to an angle formed between the first and second housings. Park, for example, on the other hand discloses a Lens that is manually adjusted by the user with a knob. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Claim 17, which depends from claim 13, and was also rejected, is also now patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art for at least the same reason that claim 13 is distinguishable.


Applicants respectfully submit claims 1-4 and 618 are allowable over Park and any other cited prior art and the case is in condition for allowance. Claim 5 was cancelled in Applicants' response of December 22, 2006.

The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel if it will advance the prosecution of this application, or with any suggestion to resolve any condition that would impede allowance. In the event that any extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this response timely. Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 50-0675, Order No. 848075-49.

Attorney Docket No. 848075/0049

Respectfully submitted,

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212-756-2000


John C. Garces
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,616

Dated: June 15, 2007
New York, New York